



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,835	12/27/2001	Diana Tang	684.0006USU	9031

7590 07/15/2002

Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
10th Floor  
One Landmark Square  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HELEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*Supplemental*  
**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/032,835

Applicant(s)

TANG, DIANA

Examiner

Helen Nguyen

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 12-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 29-30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

- ❖ This is a supplemental action to correct the status of claims 29 and 30.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, drawn to a composition, species: hair conditioner (claim 9), lotion (claim 3), and emulsifiers (claim 8), in Paper No. 3 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the invention of Group I and II are overlap. This is not found persuasive because the record set forth in the previous restriction requirement clearly indicates that the delineated inventions are, in fact, patentably distinct, each from the other, and their different classification would necessitate additional searching. In addition, as to Applicant's assertion that, in the interests of public policy and the economy, both inventions should be examined; it is advised that Congress is the appropriate forum for a remedy. Further, regarding the elections of species, Applicant argues that the "plurality of species" have commonality. Applicant's argument is mere opinion. Applicant may overcome the election of species requirement simply by stating on the record that they are not patentably distinct. However, an art rejection over one species shall then apply to all.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 29-30 are presented for examination. Because no art was found over the elected species in claim 8, the election of species in claim 8 is withdrawn.

### ***Specification objection***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

1. On page 1, line 23; and page 2, lines 5 and 7 of the specification, the terms "amongst" and "combing" are misspelled.
2. On page 4, line 14 of the specification, the term "trimethylnol" is indefinite. Does Applicant intend "triethanol"?

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim rejection- 35 USC § 112***

❖ The following is a quotation of the **first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the polymer recited in claim 29, does not reasonably provide enablement for any other polyurethane polyester polyquat. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to

Art Unit: 1617

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make/use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. On page 4, lines 13-21 of the specification, Applicant discloses only the polymer recited in claim 29. No others polyurethane polyesterpolyquats are specified.

❖ The following is a quotation of the **second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3, and 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the term "suitable" is vague. Under what condition?

***Claim rejection- 35 USC § 102***

❖ The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1617

- Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Kato (US Patent No. 6,114,057).

Kato teaches polyester polyurethane containing quaternary ammonium salts (abstract). Isophorone diisocyanate is specified (column 5, line 8). Carbon black is disclosed (column 17, line 57).

### ***Conclusion***

Claims 1-3, and 5-11 are rejected.

Claims 29-30 are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1198. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's primary, Edward J. Webman can be reached at (703) 308-4432 or her supervisor, Minna Moezie can be reached at (703) 308-4612. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are

Art Unit: 1617

(703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 305-3592  
for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of  
this application or proceeding should be directed to the  
receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Helen Nguyen  
Patent Examiner

May 7, 2002



EDWARD J. WEBMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1500